UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY CIVIL ACTION NO 16-MD-2738 (FLW) (LHG)

THE HONORABLE LOIS H. GOODMAN, USMJ

: TRANSCRIPT OF
IN RE JOHNSON & JOHNSON : STATUS CONFERENCE

POWDER PRODUCTS MARKETING, :

SALES PRACTICES. : MAY 2, 2017 \_\_\_\_\_

CLARKSON S. FISHER UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

402 EAST STATE STREET, TRENTON, NJ 08608

B E F O R E: THE HONORABLE FREDA L. WOLFSON, USDJ

APPEARANCES:

BEASLEY ALLEN, ESQUIRES

BY: P. LEIGH O'DELL, ESQUIRE (ALABAMA)

-and-

ASHCRAFT & GEREL, ESQUIRES

BY: MICHELLE A. PARFITT, ESQUIRE (VIRGINIA)

CHRIS TISI, ESQUIRE (VIRGINIA)

-and-

COHEN, PLACITELLA & ROTH, ESQUIRES

BY: CHRISTOPHER M. PLACITELLA, ESQUIRE (NEW JERSEY)

On Behalf of the Plaintiffs Steering Committee

DRINKER, BIDDLE & REATH, ESQUIRES

BY: JULIE L. TERSIGNI, ESQUIRE (NEW JERSEY)

-and-

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON, ESQUIRES

BY: KATHLEEN FRAZIER, ESQUIRE (TEXAS)

PATRICK OOT, ESQUIRE (WASHINGTON, D.C.)

On behalf of Defendant Johnson & Johnson

(Continued)

1

\* \* \* \* \*

VINCENT RUSSONIELLO, RPR, CRR, CCR OFFICIAL U.S. COURT REPORTER (609)588-9516

2 APPEARANCES CONTINUED: SEYFARTH & SHAW, ESQUIRES BY: THOMAS L. LOCKE, ESQUIRE (WASHINGTON D.C.) On behalf of Defendant PCPC COUGHLIN DUFFY, ESQUIRES BY: LORNA A. DOTRO, ESQUIRE (NEW JERSEY) -and-GORDON & REES, ESQUIRES BY: ANN THORNTON FIELD, ESQUIRE (PENNSYLVANIA) On behalf of Defendant Imerys Talc America

CERTIFICATE

PURSUANT TO TITLE 28, U.S.C., SECTION 753, THE FOLLOWING TRANSCRIPT IS CERTIFIED TO BE AN ACCURATE TRANSCRIPTION OF MY STENOGRAPHIC NOTES IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.

S/Vincent Russoniello
VINCENT RUSSONIELLO, CCR
OFFICIAL U.S. COURT REPORTER

3

```
4
             (In open court.)
 1
 2
            THE CLERK: All rise.
 3
            JUDGE WOLFSON:
                             Thank you.
            JUDGE GOODMAN: Thank you.
 4
            (Appearances noted.)
 5
             (Discussion off-the-record.)
 6
 7
 8
            JUDGE WOLFSON:
                             On the record.
 9
            JUDGE GOODMAN:
                             I just wanted to put on the
    record where we're going in terms of the preservation
10
    notices that are going to be sent out to the
11
12
    healthcare providers for the different plaintiffs.
13
            With regard to existing cases, those notices
14
    will be sent out within 45 days.
            With regard to new and transferred cases, the
15
    notices will be sent out within 30 days of when those
16
17
    cases get filed here.
18
            In addition to the preservation notice
19
    recipients that everyone has agreed on, I'm ordering
    that plaintiffs include those categories of providers
20
21
    that defendants identified, the hematologists, the
22
    gastroenterologists, the pharmacists, the mental
23
    health providers if the plaintiff made a claim for
    emotional distress.
24
25
            By enumerating those, I don't mean to leave
```

```
5
    out any because I am fine with the list that
1
 2
    defendants have suggested.
 3
            With regard to those that you have agreed on,
    I believe that you have agreed on them without any
 4
    time restraints.
 5
 6
            With regard to the others that I'm ordering
 7
    you to include, I'm telling you to go back to
 8
    providers that were providing care services to the
 9
    plaintiffs at any time within the five years preceding
    the plaintiffs' diagnosis and forward to present.
10
11
            I think we're all in agreement. But I want it
12
    to be clear that anyone receiving a preservation
13
    notice should be told to preserve their entire file to
14
    the extent it still exists, not just the file for the
15
    five-year period.
16
            Is that clear? Any questions or
    clarifications needed?
17
18
            MS. O'DELL: No, your Honor.
19
            MS. FRAZIER: No, your Honor.
20
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Off the record.
21
            (Discussion off-the-record.)
22
23
            JUDGE WOLFSON:
                             We've been having a discussion
    with regard to responsiveness of J&J's production
24
25
    specifically regarding not engaging in duplicative
```

discovery of what was already done in the state court litigation.

We had some back and forth with Mr. Tisi on behalf of the plaintiffs group and Ms. Frazier as to focusing on specifically the document requests that were made in the St. Louis litigation.

Ms. Frazier, you submitted a letter response on April 28th as to what your production was to encompass. Would you please place on the record what that was and what the meaning of that is so we can go forward.

MS. FRAZIER: Okay.

On page 3 of the April 28th letter under the header "Prior Productions and Supplemental Discovery,"

I gave a bullet pointed list of what our general responsiveness criteria were used in the review for the previous productions, and the first bullet point says:

"Generally, documents related to talc, baby powder, Johnson's Baby Powder, or Shower to Shower were considered responsive if they related to the safety, marketing, research and development, testing, complaints, specifications, labeling, or regulatory issues."

The word "generally" for my purposes was meant

```
7
    to limit it with respect to the bullet points that
1
 2
    follow that first sentence.
 3
            In other words, if you take into account those
    bullet points that follow, you could actually delete
 4
    the word "generally."
 5
            JUDGE WOLFSON: I think we have an
 6
7
    understanding then.
8
            Now, we're ready to move forward with the
 9
    plaintiffs serving whatever supplemental requests that
10
    are appropriate.
11
            MR. TISI: Thank you.
12
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Off the record.
13
            (Discussion off-the-record.)
14
15
            JUDGE GOODMAN: So now we're talking about the
    third party subpoenas that plaintiffs have served on
16
17
    various entities and individuals that's on page 4 of
    the proposed joint agendas that you sent for today's
18
    conference.
19
20
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Do you have copies of the
21
    subpoenas?
22
            MS. PARFITT: Your Honor, I have only one
    copy. I can provide them to the Court.
23
24
             (Pause.)
25
            JUDGE GOODMAN: As we read this, it appears
```

The first is obviously the relationship between these defendants and these companies, and I'll go through them.

The second one is communications regarding to these entities and their products regarding to and with regard to the general issue in this case, the general causation which your Honors have permitted counsel to in fact make inquiry of not only in personal injury cases but also the consumer.

A lot of these have relevance to the consumer class cases which is very important. Some of the requests that we would make through interrogatories and requests for production might vary a little bit because we're also encompassing the consumer class.

And the last question -- and there are really three, they are all fairly identical -- address the fact that we've got -- actually, it's two questions and the last is the documents referencing them.

Let me tell you a little bit about the defendants and the third parties.

JUDGE GOODMAN: Let me read Schedule B first.

That's also documents showing the "relationship" is one. Two is "communications."

MS. PARFITT: Correct.

JUDGE GOODMAN: And three, "documents,

```
10
    receipts, invoices" --
1
 2
            MS. PARFITT: Correct.
 3
            JUDGE GOODMAN: -- "accounting, proposals,
    remuneration paid" -- I assume by the party you are
 4
    serving on -- "to any of the following entities," and
 5
    that is not limited to in some way to talc. I'll
 6
 7
    certainly hear you. But I have no idea what that
 8
    means.
            MS. PARFITT: I think what's important perhaps
    is to understand those individuals to whom we're
10
    asking relationship, asking about the relationship.
11
12
            For instance, CRE is the Center for Regulatory
13
    Effectiveness. They are very much tied into the CIR.
    If you recall perhaps even from science day, they were
14
    part of the CIR, which is the Cosmetic Ingredient
15
    Review, the safety risk assessment for talc.
16
17
            Members of the CRE and CIR were part of
    putting that review draft together, and then
18
    ultimately finalizing that draft, and 15 talks about
19
    the safety or not of talc.
20
21
            JUDGE WOLFSON: There is no limitation to
22
    these questions. It's just the relationship.
23
            Let's start with Colgate Palmolive. Why have
24
    you targeted Colgate Palmolive.
25
            MS. PARFITT: Because we believe that Colgate
```

```
Palmolive also with regard to the asbestos issue, with
1
 2
    regard to the silica issue, with regard to the
 3
    ingredients in talc also would have had some
    documentation or communications back and forth between
 4
 5
    J&J and Imerys, perhaps PCPC --
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Because they produce a talc
 6
 7
    product?
            MS. PARFITT: Because they also have related
 8
 9
    products, right, that are used within their products.
    That's correct.
10
11
            They would also have had some engagement with
12
    talc over the course of the production of their
13
    products generally. We don't know what those are.
                                                         So
14
    we have to make some inquiry and they are fairly
15
    general.
16
            JUDGE WOLFSON: But you have to have some
17
    limitation. If you're targeting them -- look, they'll
    have their own objections to make. We haven't even
18
    gotten to those upon whom you served the subpoena.
19
    We're simply looking at J&J saying that this is going
20
21
    to cover products that aren't involved here.
22
            I have no doubt that whoever you are serving
23
    this on will be making their applications to Judge
    Goodman in no time to quash these subpoenas as being
24
```

overbroad and burdensome to them. And the way they

25

are drafted, you are open to that. So I'm telling you that today.

MS. PARFITT: If I may, maybe I can start here. Because of the product's history, we're talking decades, and I know your Honors know that. These Palmolive -- many of the other third-party persons have been involved in production of talc like products for decades as well. And so the difficulty we have as Plaintiffs is -- I guess we've said this too many times -- we don't know what we don't know.

We know that they have talc related products. And so we know that they have been involved in, perhaps, PCPC, the trade association. A lot of these folks are members of the trade association and they work collectively with regard to decision-making regarding the safety of talc or not. They work collectively with regard to decision-making as to whether or not talc should be regulated in some form or another.

So all of those third parties that we have here are members either of a trade association or in fact have had some production history of talc related products. And so what we're trying to get out is what period of time?

JUDGE WOLFSON: But you have some limitation

```
in No. 2, but you have no limitation in No. 1.
1
 2
    least put that same limitation in No. 1.
 3
            JUDGE GOODMAN: This is a deposition notice?
    I'm looking at Schedule A. That's a deposition
 4
 5
    notice, isn't it?
 6
            MS. PARFITT: No. What we had asked for, your
 7
    Honor, is --
 8
            JUDGE GOODMAN: It certainly looks like it.
            JUDGE WOLFSON: It says, "please find attached
 9
    a subpoena for testimony and production of associated
10
    documents..." It is a subpoena duces tecum plus
11
12
    document production because in fact you said "appear
13
    and be prepared to provide testimony."
14
            MS. PARFITT: And what we have done, your
    Honor, and we have done this in state court cases, not
15
    with these corporate individuals, but we communicated
16
17
    with their counsel and we have had discussions with
    regard to the nature of the production, and then we
18
    made the decision, perhaps, held off the deposition in
19
    most cases, get the production of the documents, look
20
21
    through them, and see if that adequately answers the
22
    needs of the plaintiffs.
23
            We're not rushing to take depositions of every
24
    single one of these individuals. But what it does
```

provide us with is a date certain certain that these

25

individuals, these third parties turn over the documents.

I can tell you personally, I've had some of these attorneys call me that represent these companies, these third parties, and say, Ms. Parfitt, this is what we have available.

We have conversations and I'm able to discern at that point in time the period of time that they might have relevant documents. And just like J&J and Imerys, when they say, we make products that just don't involve talc. We make Tylenol. We have other products. You don't need to know about our Tylenol. You may need to know about our talc.

Similarly, with regard to many of these third parties, we have tried to be very cooperative in scope. A lot of this goes to the communication. What do you have? Over what time period?

One company I spoke with indicated, Michelle, at one point in time we were a very large company.

Now, we're down to a handful of people. You're asking for all my documents and you want them in 30 days. I can't get them to you in 30 days. But I can get them to you maybe in 90 days based upon the scope.

So that's the kind of coordination. But I can assure the Court that each one of these third-party

subpoenas have been issued to people upon reasonable belief, information and belief, they have something to do with the talc world. Whether or not they had involvement in the regulatory history of the product, whether or not they have some marketing history, whether or not they were a marketing and sales group for one of these talc products, it depends on the third party. 

JUDGE WOLFSON: Can you tell me the relevance of this to causation? Because obviously these aren't J&J's products. They are their own talc products and what they may have known or what they put in their own is a different question. So where is this going to causation?

MS. PARFITT: General causation, whether or not they have evaluated the safety of talc themselves. In some of these cases many of them have had to make those kinds of judgments as to whether or not to include talc in some of their products that they make or not.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Well, their judgements don't make a big difference to us unless they were shared with J&J somewhere and they were made aware. You have to show some knowledge that they communicated something with J&J that made them aware at some point.

```
That's why I'm saying we really need to hone
1
 2
    these things some way that bring it into our case, or
 3
    if they ran their own studies and had experts, but
    again how that was shared and known in the industry.
 4
 5
            MS. PARFITT: If I may, I can answer that one,
 6
    what we do know is that these third parties many of
 7
    them are parts of trade associations. They contribute
 8
    to the information base with regard to the safety of
    talc along with J&J and Imerys and many other
 9
    manufacturers that make talc related products. And so
10
    they share information. They pool resources.
11
12
            So what we're interested in knowing is when
13
    they pooled resources with J&J, and that could be
14
    human resources, scientific information, medical
15
    information. There is a sharing of the technology, of
    the scientific knowledge with regard to the safety.
16
17
    They all pool this information together.
18
            JUDGE GOODMAN: But that's not what you are
19
    asking for here.
20
            MS. PARFITT: I am asking for the
21
    communications. So what I would like to know,
22
    frankly, is what is the relationship between Colgate
23
    Palmolive and someone like CRE or IMA.
24
                            Who is Jim Tozzi?
            JUDGE WOLFSON:
25
            MS. PARFITT: Jim Tozzi is with CRE, I
```

1 believe. It's CRE or CIR. I should know.

MR. LOCKE: If I can interject, it's CRE. CRE is a separate entity from CIR. It's a misstatement to say that those entities are tied together. CRE submitted information, its position on talc, to CIR along with a lot of other entities. That's all part of the public record that we already produced.

MS. PARFITT: Your Honor, it's not, if I may differ with Mr. Locke.

We have not had the benefit of all the communications between CRE, CIR, IMA. All of those are industry related organizations and they are industries that have had experience with regard to the talc products. They are industries who have engaged J&J and Imerys, some of the defendants in this case, with regard to the safety of talc, which is a general causation issue.

All of them have had some discussions, communications, research science that has been shared with J&J, the extent to which I have to acknowledge I don't know the extent. I won't know the extent until I look at their documents.

But I can tell you, upon reviewing some third-party productions, and not all of them because we don't have them all, what we have certainly been

able to find and see and review is that there has been this is interrelationship between these industrial organizations or industries that actually produce talc related products sometime either in their past or currently where there are decisions made with regard to the safety.

That's the general causation. It would be important to know if a decision was made not to include talc in a product again because there is a litany of science which they've collected which they shared with J&J and Imerys, and J&J made the decision either not to warn or not to take proper directives with regard to informing the public and the scientific — if one group does and one group doesn't and you are talking about the same product, that's important.

So what we're trying to do is just get our arms around these other third parties. This isn't a hit or miss where we threw a stone out there and just whatever we hit. We have collectively gone through these individual groups looking at Imerys and J&J documents.

Are there communications with CIR? Are there communications with CRE? Are there communications with Palmolive? We've looked at that. We have perhaps their side of the communication. We may not

have the full exchange.

So that's what we're trying to get at. We moved these very, very slowly. There are frankly a handful of third parties that have been served up to this date. We'll look at them, find out if they're meaningful, and report back to the Court. We're not trying to conduct an exercise in futility here.

We have closely examined what documents we do have and the knowledge that we do have with regard to Imerys and J&J and PCPC's relationship with these various industries, and we have reason to believe that it provides important information about the safety of talc, the general causation issue here, those sales and marketing that go to the consumer case.

Again, that's a little different, a little broader, the sales and marketing, but your Honors have said we may look at those issues as well. So the collective group, that's precisely what we're doing. Long history. Lots of organizations. Lots of regulatory meetings where all these people may have participated or at least some of them.

So what we did is we tried to take a slow-step approach. We didn't subpoena the world. We sent basically less than ten third-party subpoenas out which your Honor has. We're collecting those. We're

talking to their counsel.

At this point in time, we don't have grave objections from their counsel. If it's irrelevant, they will let us know that and that will become a debate. But I will tell you, I think this is a good first step.

MR. PLACITELLA: Let's get some concrete examples. Let's say it's Colgate Palmolive and they get their talc from the same mine at a select period of time as Johnson & Johnson did, and Colgate Palmolive ran tests on the talc from that mine that go to the toxicity or constituents of ingredients of that talc, that would be relevant to what was going into the Johnson & Johnson talc.

They may do a test on an Imerys supply which would be similar if not identical to Johnson & Johnson. That's an example. Or a lot of times what happens in industry is, for example, Colgate Palmolive will run tests on the Johnson & Johnson talc as a competitive testing and that happens, and I'm sure Johnson & Johnson did it as it relates to Colgate Palmolive.

For example, I know why they went to Manville because Manville was the world expert on testing for asbestos. And what companies would do is, they would

actually go to Johns Manville and they would ask them to run tests on their talc to determine if they have asbestos in their talc. The Johns-Manville is pretty easy. I know from years of experience, it's electronically stored. It's really not burdensome in any respect. Or there is information back and forth between Johnson & Johnson and say Colgate Palmolive on the toxicity of talc generally or through a trade association on the toxicity of talc.

Those are some examples of the kind of information we think would be relevant to the science and to causation directly and it directly relates to the products at issue, just as examples.

MS. DOTRO: Your Honor, anything related to individual testing by any of the entities served with the subpoenas was not asked for in the subpoenas.

These subpoenas go strictly to regulatory, liability issues that the Court has said we are not addressing now.

The plaintiffs made two points in the agenda. First, that this goes to the defendants' knowledge of the increased risk of cancer. That's company liability, Judge, not general causation. You've made it clear that we are going directly to general causation.

They talk about contaminants found in these products. Contaminants found in the products of Colgate Palmolive, Proctor & Gamble, Johns Manville and any of these other entities are not products at issue in this litigation.

We think that these subpoenas are overly broad and they're outside of the scope of what the Court has ordered be done at this time.

MS. FRAZIER: Your Honor, I don't have really anything to add beyond what Ms. Dotro has said. But I think what we're trying to avoid, if possible, is these side issues slowing down the progress of moving toward the causation issue.

JUDGE GOODMAN: Well, I'm going to tell you, I have a real problem with this and I didn't think I was going to have this problem going into it.

Mr. Placitella, what you said makes perfect sense. But I don't see it in the schedules to these subpoenas. I see something much broader. I don't see, as Ms. Dotro said, I don't see a request for testing that was done. To me what both you and Ms. Parfitt have outlined are communications with J&J, not with Tozzi and CRE and all of these other entities let alone law firms. I don't understand it.

To me what your identifying that you are

```
trying to find out is testing that was done as to the
1
 2
    causation issues and communicated to defendants.
    isn't that what you are asking for?
 3
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Or even communicated to one of
 4
 5
    these agencies, but again related to that testing.
            JUDGE GOODMAN: It somehow had to get back to
 6
 7
    them or else you can't hold them to have notice of it,
 8
    knowledge of it, or to have acted on it.
            I'm also troubled by what I hear as these
 9
    subpoenas, which I think are incredibly broad, being
10
    the first step and that perhaps you intend to do more
11
12
    like these.
13
            I see this as opening up a whole other avenue
    of litigation that will not necessarily all come to
14
    meet, but maybe elsewhere around the country, and this
15
    is going to be a real detour that I would rather not
16
17
    go down because I don't see the connection between
    what you are saying and what I'm reading.
18
            MS. PARFITT: May I be heard, your Honor?
19
            JUDGE GOODMAN:
20
                             Sure.
21
            MS. PARFITT: I appreciate it.
22
            Perhaps, I'll take the last point that your
23
    Honor made and that is with regard to the first step.
24
            What I was referring to, your Honor, is that
```

there are five subpoenas here and what we are hoping

25

```
to do -- we tried to target our efforts to obtain to
1
 2
    the best of our ability relevant documentation,
 3
    communication, testing, sales and marketing
    information relevant to the consumer case.
 4
            JUDGE WOLFSON: But you didn't say those
 5
 6
    things. Let's go with that, Ms. Parfitt. That's the
 7
    problem that Judge Goodman is addressing.
 8
            Let's be clear so the record says it.
            "Schedule A, the relationship between you and
 9
    each of the following entities, A through V," without
10
    limitation, relationship. That's to me is so
11
12
    overbroad I'd strike it right there.
13
            "No. 2, communications between you and any of
14
    the following entities relating to talc, and/or talcum
    powder products, including but not limited to; the
15
    health effects of talc, and/or talcum powder products;
16
17
    talc based body powder and/or ovarian cancer; and the
    presence of asbestos, arsenic, silica, quartz, or any
18
    other adulterants..."
19
20
            Communications. It doesn't say testing.
21
    doesn't say documents related to testing. It doesn't
22
    say, for instance, as Mr. Placitella honed in on,
    which I certainly understand then the example you gave
23
```

of, if indeed they obtained talc from a particular

mine that you think J&J did as well that you believe

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

```
they tested and was adulterated or whatever, well,
    let's get to what we're talking about. This doesn't
    do it. This is every communication they've ever had.
    That doesn't get us to the defendants in this case.
            So you may be able to come up with subpoenas
    that are more properly drawn that would deal with the
    issues of causation, but these don't. They do lots of
    things and that's not what -- we'll use the phrase --
    a fishing expedition is not for discovery. Let's hone
    it. This does not.
            It's very nice that these other companies are
    calling you up and happily just talking to you and
    saying let's break this down to what it is. But it's
    your job in the first instance to narrow it. Because
    the next step is, if we don't do that here, they are
    getting their motions to file to quash. They are all
17
    shaking their heads, yes, that's what's going to
    happen, and we're telling you today, it's going to
    happen.
            MS. PARFITT: Why don't we do this, your
    Honor, if this will be agreeable with the Court.
            JUDGE WOLFSON:
                            Okay.
23
                          Why don't we, understanding the
            MS. PARFITT:
```

Court's concern, and hopefully clarifying perhaps a little bit.

```
You mentioned a law firm. Why would you want
1
2
    the law firm? It just so happens, that law firm
3
    funded a scientific study on general causation. That
    was the relevance. We weren't just reaching out to
4
5
    law firms ad hoc. This happens to be a law firm that
6
    is repeatedly referred to throughout the J&J/Imerys
7
    documents.
8
            THE COURT: Not that they may have had a 50
9
    year history with this law firm doing all kinds of
    things for them unrelated. This is the problem with
10
    all of these requests.
11
12
            JUDGE GOODMAN: And then the third request
13
    which is "payments, dues, membership fees,
14
    contributions, remunerations," I think you see where
15
    we're going here.
16
            MS. PARFITT: Judge Goodman, I understand. Let
17
    me just clarify with regard to invoices and dues which
    might sound a little bit outlandish.
18
            That goes to participation. The CTFA and PCPC
19
    industries can participate as a representative
20
21
    industry in this larger trade association. The trade
22
    association one of its missions is to -- how should I
```

So we were looking to see -- I understand the lack of clarity here and I hear what the Court is

say -- promote products.

23

24

25

saying. But the reason for invoices, that was to say 1 2 how much an industry might pay to be a participant in a trade association. I think I understand what the 3 Court is asking. I hear you loud and clear. 4 JUDGE WOLFSON: 5 I think you do. 6 MS. PARFITT: I do. So why don't we step back 7 and we will caucus and we will hopefully come up with 8 something -- excuse me, your Honor. (Pause.) 9 Mr. Tisi. JUDGE WOLFSON: 10 MR. TISI: I think there was one other issue 11 12 that came up and candidly I was involved in drafting 13 some of these. So let me at least conceptualize some 14 of these. 15 You heard on science day a lot of these different organizations have weighed in on the talc 16 17 issue and I suspect when we get to the general causation question, there is going to be some 18 representation, well, there is this long list of 19 organizations that have weighed in on this topic one 20 21 way or the other and this gives the Court --22 obviously, testing the product is one aspect of it. 23 But one of the things that will be put out there is,

well, these organizations have weighed in and said

24

25

this.

And one of the things we come across in almost every one of these cases -- I even remember back in the day to the blood litigation cases where we dealt with -- a lot of the different organizations that have a stake in the issue will influence or attempt to influence one way or the other doing it nefariously not nefariously, whatever, the outcome of the various organizations that weigh in on the topic. And one of the things we may want to do is to impeach or not or support the conclusions of some of these organizations saying, Look, you were funded by, you received funding by this organization.

This is really an industry organization that is masquerading as an independent organization. This is a company that you only provided half of the science for this organization to consider when they concluded that talc either was or was not a carcinogen.

And so one of the things that we constantly come up with in any litigation of this type is trying to look at the organizations that have weighed in on the topic and say to them, Was this an independent review of the medical and scientific literature? Or, Was this something that was done where there was undue influence in order to affect the process?

So when you see the long list of people -- and I don't have it in front of me --

JUDGE WOLFSON: Of course, these subpoenas were not served on those organizations.

MR. TISI: But they were served on the companies that participated in those organizations.

For example -- and, again, I don't have the document in front of me. But I'm very familiar because I did this kind of a thing where you have, let's say, the Endocrine Society in a case and different organizations weigh in on a topic and you find out that 10 of the 12 people that weighed in on the topic were industry consultants, had been paid by the industry, that they also had an interest in the product.

That's why when we chose the list of people that are in this Schedule A, these were people with whom these companies or organizations had an interest.

JUDGE WOLFSON: I know what you are saying and believe me I understood that from why you asked for contributions, dues, dinners. I understand the issue of influence.

I understand also from science day and many of the other cases I've handled that many studies are funded by different organizations and entities and

that therefore there is an argument as to bias as to how the study is done. I understand that.

The problem that we have, and I don't think we have to belabor it because I think I've already heard from Ms. Parfitt that you are going to go back, is that that you've created a document request that are not narrowed to what those concerns are.

So let's go there. Let's relate it to the products that we're talking about, talc products, and not anything else. For instance, if they've had communications with these various entities for 50 years about other products, we don't want those.

MR. TISI: It's not just notice to the defendants.

JUDGE WOLFSON: I know it's not a notice. I know you are talking about a causation issue as well --

MR. TISI: Correct.

DUDGE WOLFSON: -- because what is the testing being done and did you provide them with certain things that could have influenced the testing when it was done of talc products even if it wasn't specifically Shower to Shower, and then you want to relate back. And, by the way, they looked at where the talc was coming from and it was the same place.

There are separate issues here of causation and knowledge and we appreciate those. But on the causation issues, to start with, these are not narrowed and they are certainly not narrowed on any kind of knowledge question.

MR. TISI: I didn't want there to be any misunderstanding that we were only trying to get what the defendants knew or should have known because that implicates the liability question. The question is when an organization comes out with a recommendation, were they unduly influenced by somebody else?

JUDGE WOLFSON: I know that and I get that, but that is not what these requests do and they go well beyond.

So go back to the drawing board. Frankly, I would tell you at this point -- I don't care what your negotiations are with the third parties. You can tell them that the Court has said not to respond to them until they are narrowed. Because before they would even respond, I know J&J is going to try and block it and Imerys or whoever else.

You wanted to say something, Ms. Dotro?

MS. DOTRO: Yes, Judge.

There is one additional subpoena you'll see at the end to Mr. William Kelly.

Case 3:16-md-02738-MAS-RLS Document 266 Filed 05/30/17 Page 32 of 44 PageID: 3296 32 JUDGE WOLFSON: Yes. Who is that? 1 2 MS. DOTRO: He is an attorney regulatory 3 consultant that was hired by Imerys. So we would like leave to file a separate motion to quash as to the 4 entire subpoena to Mr. Kelly. 5 JUDGE WOLFSON: You're going to have privilege 6 7 issues as to him? 8 MS. DOTRO: Absolutely. JUDGE WOLFSON: That's a separate question. 9 And you may do that. So we've got an issue with 10 Mr. Kelly, I understand. 11 12 So that's the direction. The recipients of 13 these subpoenas are to be told that they are not to 14 respond to them at this time. First of all, there are objections that are 15 going to be filed by Imerys and by J&J -- they were to 16 17 have been filed. I know you will as to Mr. Kelly. I'm asking that the parties not file them as to the 18 other entities until new requests are framed and 19 20 served. 21 MS. PARFITT: Your Honor, we will move very 22

quickly to do that. I can assure the Court.

23

24

25

But what I don't want to happen, as well, as your Honor has indicated, we don't want to do these month-to-month things.

So once the plaintiffs have honed in a little bit more pursuant to the Court's guidance today, we will get those out forthwith. We're not going to wait and come back. I don't assume the Court is asking us to come before the Court again.

JUDGE WOLFSON: No.

MS. PARFITT: I assume that's not what you want. So we'll move forthwith. And hopefully there won't be the objection that we had this time.

JUDGE WOLFSON: My further suggestion is to expedite this because it's not helpful for you to draft them, serve them, and then simply give them copies of them, and then we're back to, Wait a minute. We've got problems.

Redraft them, send them to the defendants in this case, and try and resolve the objections before they are served on the third party. So once they are served on the third party, we know these people are cleared.

MS. PARFITT: Your Honor, the only thing I would ask on this, and not just to throw salt at anybody here, we do want to move quickly on this. We understand what the Court has said today, keep apace, and we're interested in doing that as well.

JUDGE WOLFSON: It's in your interest.

```
MS. PARFITT: It is in everyone's interest,
1
 2
    frankly, and most importantly our clients.
 3
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Right.
            MS. PARFITT: So what I don't want to have is
 4
    a belabored meet and confer.
 5
 6
            Judge Goodman, I guess this particularly goes
 7
    to you. If we get it to the defendants, we feel we
8
    have listened to what the Court has said. It's
    reasonable. They think it's unreasonable.
            I would like to get it to the Court -- and
10
    really if that's something we could then approach you,
11
12
    Judge Goodman, very quickly on so that we could get
13
    them out, and I think you've invited us to do so. So
    I would take that invitation.
14
15
            JUDGE GOODMAN: What I would like to do, I
    would like to deal with this before the next
16
    conference. So if you folks can't work it out, why
17
    don't you plan to get me a joint submission within
18
    two weeks.
19
20
            Today is the 2nd. So by May 16. If you can
    resolve it, you tell me, All is good, don't need you,
21
22
    or you send me a joint letter that exhausts all sides'
23
    positions on the issues.
            It sounds to me like Mr. Kelly's is going to
24
25
    be a separate animal because that's not as much a
```

```
35
    scope as a privilege issue, but as to the others.
 1
 2
             JUDGE WOLFSON: So if you are not going to
 3
    back off on Mr. Kelly, then I think go file your
 4
    application.
 5
             MS. PARFITT: Very good.
 6
             JUDGE WOLFSON: Great.
 7
             Off the record.
             (Discussion off-the-record.)
 8
 9
             (Proceedings concluded.)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

36 1 2 CERTIFICATE 3 4 5 I, Vincent Russoniello, Official United States 6 7 Court Reporter and Certified Court Reporter of the 8 State of New Jersey, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings as taken stenographically by and before me 10 at the time, place and on the date hereinbefore set 11 12 forth. 13 I do further certify that I am neither a relative 14 nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a 15 relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and 16 17 that I am not financially interested in this action. 18 19 20 21 22 23 S/Vincent Russoniello 24 Vincent Russoniello, CCR Certificate No. 675 25

7	-	7

	1		3
0	3:11	20:25, 21:3, 24:18	board [1] - 31:15
	absolutely [2] - 8:21,	<b>ASHCRAFT</b> [1] - 1:15	<b>body</b> [1] - 24:17
<b>08608</b> [1] - 1:8	32:8	aspect [1] - 27:22	breadth [1] - 8:1
	account [1] - 7:3	assessment [1] - 10:16	break [1] - 25:13
1	accounting [1] - 10:3	associated [1] - 13:10	bring [1] - 16:2
<b>1</b> [2] - 13:1, 13:2	accurate [1] - 36:9	association [7] - 12:13,	broad [2] - 22:6, 23:10
<b>10</b> [1] - 29:12	<b>ACCURATE</b> [1] - 3:9	12:14, 12:21, 21:9,	broader [2] - 19:16,
<b>12</b> [1] - 29:12	acknowledge [1] - 17:20	26:21, 26:22, 27:3	22:19
<b>14</b> [1] - 8:9	acted [1] - 23:8	associations [1] - 16:7	<b>bullet</b> [4] - 6:15, 6:17,
<b>15</b> [1] - 10:19	<b>ACTION</b> [1] - 1:2	assume [3] - 10:4, 33:4,	7:1, 7:4
<b>16</b> [1] - 34:20	action [2] - 36:15, 36:17	33:7	burdensome [2] - 11:25,
16-MD-2738(FLW)(LHG	ad [1] - 26:5	assure [2] - 14:25, 32:22	21:5
[1] - 1:2	add [1] - 22:10	attached [1] - 13:9	<b>BY</b> [8] - 1:14, 1:15, 1:17,
. ,	addition [1] - 4:18	attachment [1] - 8:24	1:20, 1:21, 2:7, 2:9, 2:11
2	additional [1] - 31:24	attempt [1] - 28:5	,,,,,
<b>2</b> [4] - 1:5, 8:19, 13:1,	address [2] - 8:22, 9:16	attorney [3] - 32:2,	С
2 [4] - 1:5, 8:19, 13:1, 24:13	addressing [2] - 21:18,	36:14, 36:16	00000r[0] 04:00 04:47
<b>24</b> .13 <b>2017</b> [1] - 1:5	24:7	attorneys [1] - 14:4	cancer [2] - 21:22, 24:17
<b>28</b> [1] - 3:8	adequately [1] - 13:21	available [1] - 14:6	candidly [1] - 27:12
<b>28</b> [1] - 3:8 <b>28th</b> [2] - 6:8, 6:13	adulterants [1] - 24:19	avenue [1] - 23:13	carcinogen [1] - 28:18
<b>2nd</b> [1] - 34:20	adulterated [1] - 25:1	avoid [1] - 22:11	care [2] - 5:8, 31:16
<b>2110</b> [1] - 34.20	affect [1] - 28:25	aware [2] - 15:23, 15:25	<b>case</b> [9] - 8:5, 9:6, 16:2,
3	agencies [1] - 23:5	. ,	17:15, 19:14, 24:4, 25:4, 29:10, 33:16
	agenda [1] - 21:20	В	
<b>3</b> [1] - 6:13	agendas [1] - 7:18		<b>cases</b> [11] - 4:13, 4:15, 4:17, 9:9, 9:11, 13:15,
<b>30</b> [3] - 4:16, 14:21,	agreeable [1] - 25:21	baby [1] - 6:19	13:20, 15:17, 28:2, 28:3,
14:22	agreed [3] - 4:19, 5:3, 5:4	Baby [1] - 6:20	13.20, 15.17, 26.2, 26.3, 29:24
<u>.</u>	agreement [1] - 5:11	BACON [1] - 1:21	categories [1] - 4:20
4	ALABAMA [1] - 1:14	base [1] - 16:8 based [2] - 14:23, 24:17	categories [1] - 4.20
<b>4</b> [1] - 7:17	<b>ALLEN</b> [1] - 1:13	baseu [2] - 14.23, 24.17 basis [1] - 8:3	causation [18] - 9:7,
<b>402</b> [1] - 1:8	almost [1] - 28:1	<b>BE</b> [1] - 8:3	15:10, 15:14, 15:15,
<b>45</b> [1] - 4:14	alone [1] - 22:24	BEASLEY [1] - 1:13	17:17, 18:7, 19:13,
	America [1] - 2:11	become [1] - 20:4	21:12, 21:23, 21:25,
5	<b>AN</b> [1] - 3:9	Behalf [1] - 1:18	22:13, 23:2, 25:7, 26:3,
<b>50</b> [2] - 26:8, 30:12	animal [1] - 34:25	<b>behalf</b> [4] - 1:22, 2:7,	27:18, 30:16, 31:1, 31:3
	<b>ANN</b> [1] - 2:11	0.44 0.4	<b>CCR</b> [3] - 1:24, 3:16,
6	answer [1] - 16:5	2:11, 6:4 <b>belabor</b> [1] - 30:4	36:24
	answers [1] - 13:21	belabored [1] - 34:5	Center [1] - 10:12
<b>609)588-9516</b> [1] - 1:25	apace [1] - 33:23	belief [2] - 15:2	certain [3] - 13:25, 30:20
<b>675</b> [1] - 36:24	appear [1] - 13:12	<b>benefit</b> [1] - 17:10	certainly [5] - 10:7, 13:8,
7	appearances [1] - 4:5	best [1] - 24:2	17:25, 24:23, 31:4
	application [1] - 35:4	best [1] - 24.2 between [10] - 8:12, 9:2,	<b>Certificate</b> [1] - 36:24
<b>753</b> [1] - 3:8	applications [1] - 11:23	11:4, 16:22, 17:11, 18:2,	<b>CERTIFIED</b> [1] - 3:9
	appreciate [2] - 23:21,	21:7, 23:17, 24:9, 24:13	Certified [1] - 36:7
9	31:2	beyond [2] - 22:10, 31:14	certify [2] - 36:8, 36:13
<b>90</b> [1] - 14:23	approach [2] - 19:23,	bias [1] - 30:1	<b>chose</b> [1] - 29:16
	34:11	<b>BIDDLE</b> [1] - 1:19	CHRIS [1] - 1:16
Α	appropriate [1] - 7:10	big [1] - 15:22	CHRISTOPHER [1] -
ability [1] - 24:2	<b>April</b> [2] - 6:8, 6:13	<b>bit</b> [6] - 8:3, 9:13, 9:19,	1:17
<b>able</b> [3] - 14:7, 18:1, 25:5	argument [1] - 30:1	25:25, 26:18, 33:2	<b>CIR</b> [8] - 10:13, 10:15,
<b>ABOVE</b> [1] - 3:11	arms [1] - 18:17	block [1] - 31:20	10:17, 17:1, 17:3, 17:5,
	arsenic [1] - 24:18	blood [1] - 28:3	17:11, 18:22
ABOVE-ENTITLED [1] -	asbestos [4] - 11:1,	2.304 [1] 20.0	

**CIVIL** [1] - 1:2 claim [1] - 4:23 clarifications [1] - 5:17 clarify [1] - 26:17 clarifying [1] - 25:24 clarity [1] - 26:25 **CLARKSON** [1] - 1:8 class [2] - 9:11, 9:14 clear [5] - 5:12, 5:16, 21:24, 24:8, 27:4 cleared [1] - 33:19 **CLERK** [1] - 4:2 clients [1] - 34:2 closely [1] - 19:8 **COHEN** [1] - 1:17 Colgate [11] - 8:22, 10:23, 10:24, 10:25, 16:22, 20:8, 20:10, 20:18, 20:21, 21:7, 22:3 collected [1] - 18:10 collecting [1] - 19:25 **collective** [1] - 19:18 **collectively** [3] - 12:15, 12:17, 18:19 coming [1] - 30:25 Committee [1] - 1:18 communicated [4] -13:16, 15:24, 23:2, 23:4 communication [4] -14:16, 18:25, 24:3, 25:3 communications [14] -8:19, 9:4, 9:23, 11:4, 16:21, 17:11, 17:19, 18:22, 18:23, 22:22, 24:13, 24:20, 30:11 companies [6] - 9:2, 14:5, 20:25, 25:11, 29:6, 29:18 company [4] - 14:18, 14:19, 21:22, 28:15 competitive [1] - 20:20 complaints [1] - 6:23 conceptualize [1] -27:13 concern [1] - 25:24 concerns [1] - 30:7 concluded [2] - 28:17, conclusions [1] - 28:10 concrete [1] - 20:7 conduct [1] - 19:7 confer [1] - 34:5 CONFERENCE [1] - 1:4

conference [2] - 7:19, 34:17 connection [1] - 23:17 consider [1] - 28:16 considered [1] - 6:21 **constantly** [1] - 28:19 constituents [1] - 20:12 consultant [1] - 32:3 **consultants** [1] - 29:13 consumer [5] - 9:9, 9:10, 9:14, 19:14, 24:4 contaminants [2] - 22:1, 22:2 continued [1] - 1:23 contribute [1] - 16:7 contributions [2] -26:14, 29:21 conversations [1] - 14:7 cooperative [1] - 14:15 **coordination** [1] - 14:24 **copies** [3] - 7:20, 8:7, 33:13 copy [1] - 7:23 **corporate** [1] - 13:16 correct [4] - 9:24, 10:2, 11:10, 30:18 correctly [1] - 8:23 Cosmetic [1] - 10:15 **COUGHLIN** [1] - 2:9 counsel [6] - 9:8, 13:17, 20:1, 20:3, 36:14, 36:16 country [1] - 23:15 course [2] - 11:12, 29:3 **court** [3] - 4:1, 6:1, 13:15 Court [18] - 7:23, 14:25, 19:6, 21:18, 22:7, 25:21, 26:25, 27:4, 27:21, 31:18, 32:22, 33:4, 33:5, 33:23, 34:8, 34:10, 36:7 **COURT** [4] - 1:1, 1:25, 3:16, 26:8 Court's [2] - 25:24, 33:2 COURTHOUSE [1] - 1:8 cover [1] - 11:21 CRE [11] - 10:12, 10:17, 16:23, 16:25, 17:1, 17:2, 17:4, 17:11, 18:23, 22:23 created [1] - 30:6 criteria [1] - 6:16 CRR [1] - 1:24

**CTFA** [1] - 26:19

**D.C** [2] - 1:22, 2:7 date [3] - 13:25, 19:5, days [5] - 4:14, 4:16, 14:21, 14:22, 14:23 deal [2] - 25:6, 34:16 dealt [1] - 28:3 debate [1] - 20:5 decades [2] - 12:5, 12:8 decision [5] - 12:15, 12:17, 13:19, 18:8, 18:11 decision-making [2] -12:15, 12:17 decisions [1] - 18:5 **Defendant** [3] - 1:22, 2:7, 2:11 defendants [13] - 4:21, 5:2, 8:1, 8:15, 9:2, 9:20, 17:15, 23:2, 25:4, 30:14, 31:8, 33:15, 34:7 defendants' [1] - 21:21 delete [1] - 7:4 deposition [3] - 13:3, 13:4, 13:19 depositions [1] - 13:23 determine [1] - 21:2 detour [1] - 23:16 development [1] - 6:22 diagnosis [1] - 5:10 differ [1] - 17:9 difference [1] - 15:22 different [7] - 4:12, 15:13, 19:15, 27:16, 28:4, 29:11, 29:25 difficulty [1] - 12:8 dinners [1] - 29:21 direction [1] - 32:12 directives [1] - 18:12 directly [3] - 21:12, 21:24 discern [1] - 14:7 discovery [2] - 6:1, 25:9 **Discovery** [1] - 6:14 **Discussion** [2] - 4:6, 35:8 discussion [3] - 5:21, 5:23, 7:13 discussions [2] - 13:17, 17:18 distress [1] - 4:24 **DISTRICT** [2] - 1:1, 1:1

D

document [4] - 6:5, 13:12, 29:8, 30:6 documentation [2] -11:4, 24:2 documents [13] - 6:19, 9:18, 9:22, 9:25, 13:20, 14:2, 14:9, 14:21, 17:22, 18:21, 19:8, 24:21, 26:7 documents.. [1] - 13:11 done [10] - 6:1, 13:14, 13:15, 22:8, 22:21, 23:1, 28:24, 30:2, 30:20, 30:22 **DOTRO** [5] - 2:9, 21:14, 31:23, 32:2, 32:8 **Dotro** [3] - 22:10, 22:20, 31:22 doubt [1] - 11:22 down [4] - 14:20, 22:12, 23:17, 25:13 draft [3] - 10:18, 10:19, 33:12 drafted [1] - 12:1 drafting [1] - 27:12 drawing [1] - 31:15 drawn [1] - 25:6 **DRINKER** [1] - 1:19 duces [1] - 13:11 dues [3] - 26:13, 26:17, 29:21 **DUFFY** [1] - 2:9 duplicative [1] - 5:25

# Ε

**EAST** [1] - 1:8 easy [1] - 21:4 Effectiveness [1] - 10:13 effects [1] - 24:16 efforts [1] - 24:1 either [4] - 12:21, 18:4, 18:12, 28:17 electronically [1] - 21:5 elsewhere [1] - 23:15 emotional [1] - 4:24 employee [2] - 36:14, 36:16 **encompass** [1] - 6:9 encompassing [1] - 9:14 end [1] - 31:25 **Endocrine** [1] - 29:10 engaged [1] - 17:14 engagement [1] - 11:11

engaging [1] - 5:25 entire [2] - 5:13, 32:5 entities [14] - 7:17, 8:13, 9:5, 10:5, 17:4, 17:6, 21:15, 22:4, 22:23, 24:10, 24:14, 29:25, 30:11, 32:19 **ENTITLED** [1] - 3:11 entity [1] - 17:3 enumerating [1] - 4:25 **ESQUIRE** [10] - 1:14, 1:15, 1:16, 1:17, 1:20, 1:21, 1:22, 2:7, 2:9, 2:11 **ESQUIRES** [8] - 1:13, 1:15, 1:17, 1:19, 1:21, 2:6, 2:9, 2:10 evaluated [1] - 15:16 **examined** [1] - 19:8 example [5] - 20:17, 20:18, 20:23, 24:23, 29:7 examples [3] - 20:8, 21:10, 21:13 exchange [1] - 19:1 excuse [1] - 27:8 exercise [1] - 19:7 exhausts [1] - 34:22 existing [1] - 4:13 exists [1] - 5:14 **expedite** [1] - 33:11 **expedition** [1] - 25:9 **experience** [2] - 17:13, 21:4 expert [1] - 20:24 experts [1] - 16:3 extent [4] - 5:14, 17:20, 17:21

# F

fact [4] - 9:8, 9:17, 12:22, 13:12

fairly [2] - 9:16, 11:14

familiar [1] - 29:8

fees [1] - 26:13

FIELD [1] - 2:11

file [6] - 5:13, 5:14, 25:16, 32:4, 32:18, 35:3

filed [3] - 4:17, 32:16, 32:17

finalizing [1] - 10:19

financially [1] - 36:17

fine [1] - 5:1

firm [5] - 26:1, 26:2, 26:5, 26:9 firms [3] - 8:17, 22:24, first [12] - 6:17, 7:2, 8:9, 8:22, 9:1, 9:21, 20:6, 21:21, 23:11, 23:23, 25:14, 32:15 **FISHER** [1] - 1:8 fishing [1] - 25:9 five [3] - 5:9, 5:15, 23:25 five-year [1] - 5:15 **focusing** [1] - 6:5 folks [2] - 12:14, 34:17 follow [2] - 7:2, 7:4 **FOLLOWING** [1] - 3:9 following [4] - 8:13, 10:5, 24:10, 24:14 **FOR** [1] - 1:1 foregoing [1] - 36:9 form [1] - 12:18 forth [4] - 6:3, 11:4, 21:6, 36:12 forthwith [2] - 33:3, 33:8 forward [3] - 5:10, 6:11, 7:8 framed [1] - 32:19 frankly [4] - 16:22, 19:3, 31:15, 34:2 **FRAZIER** [4] - 1:21, 5:19, 6:12, 22:9 Frazier [2] - 6:4, 6:7 FREDA [1] - 1:10 front [2] - 29:2, 29:8 full [1] - 19:1 funded [3] - 26:3, 28:11, 29:25 funding [1] - 28:11 futility [1] - 19:7

# G

Gamble [3] - 8:10, 8:12, 22:3
gastroenterologists [1] - 4:22
general [12] - 6:15, 9:6, 9:7, 11:15, 15:15, 17:16, 18:7, 19:13, 21:23, 21:24, 26:3, 27:17
generally [5] - 6:19, 6:25, 7:5, 11:13, 21:8
GEREL [1] - 1:15

Goodman [5] - 11:24, 24:7, 26:16, 34:6, 34:12 GOODMAN [16] - 1:11, 4:4, 4:9, 7:15, 7:25, 9:21, 9:25, 10:3, 13:3, 13:8, 16:18, 22:14, 23:6, 23:20, 26:12, 34:15 GORDON [1] - 2:10 grave [1] - 20:2 great [1] - 35:6 group [5] - 6:4, 15:6, 18:14, 19:18 groups [1] - 18:20 guess [2] - 12:9, 34:6 guidance [1] - 33:2

# Н

half [1] - 28:15

handed [1] - 8:7

handful [2] - 14:20, 19:4 handled [1] - 29:24 happily [1] - 25:12 HARDY [1] - 1:21 header [1] - 6:14 heads [1] - 25:17 health [2] - 4:23, 24:16 **healthcare** [1] - 4:12 hear [5] - 8:2, 10:7, 23:9, 26:25, 27:4 heard [3] - 23:19, 27:15, 30:4 held [1] - 13:19 helpful [1] - 33:11 hematologists [1] - 4:21 hereby [1] - 36:8 hereinbefore [1] - 36:11 hired [1] - 32:3 history [6] - 12:4, 12:22, 15:4, 15:5, 19:19, 26:9 hit [2] - 18:18, 18:19 hoc [1] - 26:5 **hold** [1] - 23:7 hone [2] - 16:1, 25:9 honed [2] - 24:22, 33:1 Honor [18] - 5:18, 5:19, 7:22, 8:23, 13:7, 13:15, 17:8, 19:25, 21:14, 22:9, 23:19, 23:23, 23:24, 25:21, 27:8, 32:21, 32:24, 33:20 **HONORABLE** [2] - 1:10, 1:11

Honors [3] - 9:7, 12:5, 19:16 hope [1] - 8:4 hopefully [3] - 25:24, 27:7, 33:8 hoping [1] - 23:25 human [1] - 16:14

#### ı

idea [1] - 10:7 identical [2] - 9:16, 20:16 identified [1] - 4:21 **identifying** [1] - 22:25 **IMA** [2] - 16:23, 17:11 **Imerys** [13] - 2:11, 8:15, 11:5, 14:10, 16:9, 17:15, 18:11, 18:20, 19:10, 20:15, 31:21, 32:3, 32:16 impeach [1] - 28:9 implicates [1] - 31:9 **important** [5] - 9:11, 10:9, 18:8, 18:15, 19:12 **importantly** [1] - 34:2 IN [2] - 1:4, 3:10 include [4] - 4:20, 5:7, 15:19, 18:9 including [2] - 8:14, 24:15 increased [1] - 21:22 incredibly [1] - 23:10 indeed [1] - 24:24 independent [2] - 28:14, 28:22 indicated [3] - 8:23, 14:18, 32:24 individual [2] - 18:20, 21:15 individuals [6] - 7:17, 8:17, 10:10, 13:16, 13:24, 14:1 industrial [1] - 18:2 industries [5] - 17:13, 17:14, 18:3, 19:11, 26:20 industry [8] - 16:4, 17:12, 20:18, 26:21, 27:2, 28:13, 29:13, 29:14 influence [4] - 28:5, 28:6, 28:25, 29:22 influenced [2] - 30:21, 31:11

information [11] - 15:2, 16:8, 16:11, 16:14, 16:15, 16:17, 17:5, 19:12, 21:6, 21:11, 24:4 informing [1] - 18:13 **Ingredient** [1] - 10:15 ingredients [2] - 11:3, 20:12 injury [1] - 9:9 inquiry [2] - 9:8, 11:14 instance [4] - 10:12, 24:22, 25:14, 30:10 intend [1] - 23:11 interest [4] - 29:14, 29:18, 33:25, 34:1 interested [3] - 16:12, 33:24, 36:17 interject [1] - 17:2 interrelationship [1] -18:2 interrogatories [1] - 9:12 invitation [1] - 34:14 invited [1] - 34:13 invoices [3] - 10:1, 26:17, 27:1 involve [1] - 14:11 involved [4] - 11:21, 12:7, 12:12, 27:12 involvement [1] - 15:4 irrelevant [1] - 20:3 **IS** [1] - 3:9 issue [16] - 8:5, 9:6, 11:1, 11:2, 17:17, 19:13, 21:13, 22:5, 22:13, 27:11, 27:17, 28:5, 29:21, 30:16, 32:10, issued [1] - 15:1 issues [10] - 6:24, 19:17, 21:18, 22:12, 23:2, 25:7,

# ١.

31:1, 31:3, 32:7, 34:23

J&J [17] - 11:5, 11:20, 14:9, 15:23, 15:25, 16:9, 16:13, 17:15, 17:20, 18:11, 18:20, 19:10, 22:22, 24:25, 31:20, 32:16 J&J's [2] - 5:24, 15:11 J&J/Imerys [1] - 26:6 Jersey [1] - 36:8 JERSEY [4] - 1:1, 1:17,

1:20, 2:9 Jim [1] - 16:24 jim [1] - 16:25 job [1] - 25:14 **Johns** [3] - 21:1, 21:3, 22:3 Johns-Manville [1] -21:3 Johnson [16] - 1:22, 8:15, 20:10, 20:14, 20:16, 20:17, 20:19, 20:21, 21:7 **JOHNSON** [2] - 1:4 **Johnson's** [1] - 6:20 joint [3] - 7:18, 34:18, 34:22 Judge [6] - 11:23, 21:23, 24:7, 31:23, 34:6, 34:12 judge [1] - 26:16 JUDGE [49] - 4:3, 4:4, 4:8, 4:9, 5:20, 5:23, 7:6, 7:12, 7:15, 7:20, 7:25, 9:21, 9:25, 10:3, 10:21, 11:6, 11:16, 12:25, 13:3, 13:8, 13:9, 15:9, 15:21, 16:18, 16:24, 22:14, 23:4, 23:6, 23:20, 24:5, 25:22, 26:12, 27:5, 27:10, 29:3, 29:19, 30:15, 30:19, 31:12, 32:1, 32:6, 32:9, 33:6, 33:10, 33:25, 34:3, 34:15, 35:2, 35:6 judgements [1] - 15:21 judgments [1] - 15:18 JULIE [1] - 1:20

# k

KATHLEEN [1] - 1:21 keep [1] - 33:23 Kelly [5] - 31:25, 32:5, 32:11, 32:17, 35:3 Kelly's [1] - 34:24 kind [4] - 14:24, 21:10, 29:9, 31:5 kinds [2] - 15:18, 26:9 knowing [1] - 16:12 knowledge [7] - 15:24, 16:16, 19:9, 21:21, 23:8, 31:2, 31:5 known [3] - 15:12, 16:4, 31:8

# labeling [1] - 6:23 lack [1] - 26:25 large [1] - 14:19 larger [1] - 26:21 last [3] - 9:15, 9:18,

L

23:22 law [8] - 8:17, 22:24, 26:1, 26:2, 26:5, 26:9 least [3] - 13:2, 19:21, 27:13

leave [2] - 4:25, 32:4 LEIGH [1] - 1:14 less [1] - 19:24 letter [3] - 6:7, 6:13,

34:22 **liability** [3] - 21:17, 21:23, 31:9

limit [1] - 7:1 limitation [6] - 10:21, 11:17, 12:25, 13:1, 13:2, 24:11

limited [2] - 10:6, 24:15 list [5] - 5:1, 6:15, 27:19, 29:1, 29:16 listened [1] - 34:8

litany [1] - 18:10 literature [1] - 28:23 litigation [6] - 6:2, 6:6, 22:5, 23:14, 28:3, 28:20 LOCKE [2] - 2:7, 17:2

Locke [1] - 17:9 LOIS [1] - 1:11 look [6] - 11:17, 13:20, 17:22, 19:5, 19:17, 28:21

Look [1] - 28:11 looked [2] - 18:24, 30:24 looking [6] - 8:9, 8:11, 11:20, 13:4, 18:20, 26:24

looks [2] - 8:8, 13:8 LORNA [1] - 2:9 loud [1] - 27:4

**Louis** [1] - 6:6

# M

manufacturers [2] - 8:5, 16:10 Manville [5] - 20:23, 20:24, 21:1, 21:3, 22:3 MARKETING [1] - 1:5 marketing [6] - 6:22, 15:5, 15:6, 19:14, 19:16, 24:3 masquerading [1] -28:14 **MATTER** [1] - 3:11 **MAY** [1] - 1:5 mean [1] - 4:25 meaning [1] - 6:10 meaningful [1] - 19:6 means [1] - 10:8 meant [1] - 6:25 medical [2] - 16:14, 28:23 meet [2] - 23:15, 34:5 meetings [1] - 19:20 members [3] - 10:17, 12:14, 12:21 membership [1] - 26:13 mental [1] - 4:22 mentioned [1] - 26:1 **Michelle** [1] - 14:18 **MICHELLE** [1] - 1:15 might [4] - 9:13, 14:9, 26:18, 27:2 mine [3] - 20:9, 20:11, 24:25 minute [1] - 33:13 miss [1] - 18:18 missions [1] - 26:22 misstatement [1] - 17:3 misunderstanding [1] -31:7 month [2] - 32:25 month-to-month [1] -32:25 most [2] - 13:20, 34:2 motion [1] - 32:4 motions [1] - 25:16 move [4] - 7:8, 32:21, 33:8, 33:22 moved [1] - 19:3 moving [1] - 22:12 **MR** [8] - 7:11, 17:2, 20:7, 27:11, 29:5, 30:13, 30:18, 31:6 **MS** [35] - 5:18, 5:19, 6:12, 7:22, 8:21, 9:24,

10:2, 10:9, 10:25, 11:8,

12:3, 13:6, 13:14, 15:15,

16:5, 16:20, 16:25, 17:8,

21:14, 22:9, 23:19,

23:21, 25:20, 25:23,

participant [1] - 27:2

26:16, 27:6, 31:23, 32:2, 32:8, 32:21, 33:7, 33:20, 34:1, 34:4, 35:5

MY [1] - 3:10

#### Ν

narrow [1] - 25:14 narrowed [4] - 30:7, 31:4, 31:19 nature [1] - 13:18 necessarily [1] - 23:14 need [4] - 14:12, 14:13, 16:1, 34:21 needed [1] - 5:17 needs [1] - 13:22 nefariously [2] - 28:6, 28:7 negotiations [1] - 31:17 New [1] - 36:8 **NEW** [4] - 1:1, 1:17, 1:20, 2:9 **new** [2] - 4:15, 32:19 next [2] - 25:15, 34:16 nice [1] - 25:11 **NJ**[1] - 1:8 **NO** [1] - 1:2 **noted** [1] - 4:5 **NOTES** [1] - 3:10 notice [7] - 4:18, 5:13, 13:3, 13:5, 23:7, 30:13, 30:15 notices [3] - 4:11, 4:13,

# 0

4:16

O'DELL [2] - 1:14, 5:18 objecting [1] - 8:1 objection [1] - 33:9 **objections** [5] - 8:6, 11:18, 20:3, 32:15, 33:16 obtain [1] - 24:1 obtained [1] - 24:24 **obviously** [3] - 9:1, 15:10, 27:22 **OF** [3] - 1:1, 1:4, 3:10 off-the-record [4] - 4:6, 5:21, 7:13, 35:8 **OFFICIAL** [2] - 1:25, 3:16 Official [1] - 36:6 once [2] - 33:1, 33:17 one [24] - 7:22, 8:9, 9:4,

9:23, 13:24, 14:18, 14:19, 14:25, 15:7, 16:5, 18:14, 23:4, 26:22, 27:11, 27:20, 27:22, 27:23, 28:1, 28:2, 28:6, 28:8, 28:19, 31:24 **OOT** [1] - 1:22 open [2] - 4:1, 12:1 opening [1] - 23:13 order [1] - 28:25 ordered [1] - 22:8 ordering [2] - 4:19, 5:6 **organization** [5] - 28:12, 28:13, 28:14, 28:16, 31:10 organizations [15] -17:12, 18:3, 19:19, 27:16, 27:20, 27:24, 28:4, 28:8, 28:10, 28:21, 29:4, 29:6, 29:11, 29:18, 29:25 outcome [1] - 28:7 outlandish [1] - 26:18 outlined [1] - 22:22 outside [1] - 22:7 ovarian [1] - 24:17 overbroad [2] - 11:25, 24:12 overly [1] - 22:6 own [4] - 11:18, 15:11, 15:12, 16:3

# Р

page [3] - 6:13, 7:17, 8:8 paid [2] - 10:4, 29:13 Palmolive [13] - 8:22, 10:23, 10:24, 11:1, 12:6, 16:23, 18:24, 20:8, 20:11, 20:18, 20:22, 21:7, 22:3 **PARFITT** [28] - 1:15, 7:22, 8:21, 9:24, 10:2, 10:9, 10:25, 11:8, 12:3, 13:6, 13:14, 15:15, 16:5, 16:20, 16:25, 17:8, 23:19, 23:21, 25:20, 25:23, 26:16, 27:6, 32:21, 33:7, 33:20, 34:1, 34:4, 35:5 Parfitt [4] - 14:5, 22:22, 24:6, 30:5 part [3] - 10:15, 10:17, 17:6

participate [1] - 26:20 participated [2] - 19:21, participation [1] - 26:19 particular [1] - 24:24 particularly [1] - 34:6 parties [11] - 9:20, 12:20, 14:1, 14:5, 14:15, 16:6, 18:17, 19:4, 31:17, 32:18, 36:15 parts [1] - 16:7 party [9] - 7:16, 10:4, 12:6, 14:25, 15:8, 17:24, 19:24, 33:17, 33:18 past [1] - 18:4 **PATRICK** [1] - 1:22 pause [2] - 7:24, 27:9 pay [1] - 27:2 payments [1] - 26:13 **PCPC** [5] - 2:7, 8:16, 11:5, 12:13, 26:19 PCPC's [1] - 19:10 PENNSYLVANIA [1] people [8] - 14:20, 15:1, 19:20, 29:1, 29:12, 29:16, 29:17, 33:18 perfect [1] - 22:17 perhaps [9] - 10:9, 10:14, 11:5, 12:13, 13:19, 18:25, 23:11, 23:22, 25:24 period [5] - 5:15, 12:24, 14:8, 14:17, 20:9 permitted [1] - 9:7 **personal** [1] - 9:9 **personally** [1] - 14:3 persons [1] - 12:6 **pharmacists** [1] - 4:22 phrase [1] - 25:8 place [3] - 6:9, 30:25, 36:11 **PLACITELLA** [3] - 1:17, 1:17, 20:7 Placitella [2] - 22:17, 24:22 plaintiff [1] - 4:23 **Plaintiffs** [2] - 1:18, 12:9 plaintiffs [10] - 4:12, 4:20, 5:9, 6:4, 7:9, 7:16, 8:4, 13:22, 21:20, 33:1 **plaintiffs'** [1] - 5:10

plan [1] - 34:18 plus [1] - 13:11 point [7] - 6:17, 14:8, 14:19, 15:25, 20:2, 23:22, 31:16 pointed [1] - 6:15 points [3] - 7:1, 7:4, 21:20 pool [2] - 16:11, 16:17 pooled [1] - 16:13 position [1] - 17:5 positions [1] - 34:23 possible [1] - 22:11 **POWDER** [1] - 1:5 powder [4] - 6:20, 24:15, 24:16, 24:17 **Powder** [1] - 6:20 **PRACTICES** [1] - 1:5 preceding [1] - 5:9 precisely [1] - 19:18 prepared [1] - 13:13 presence [1] - 24:18 present [1] - 5:10 preservation [3] - 4:10, 4:18, 5:12 preserve [1] - 5:13 pretty [1] - 21:3 previous [1] - 6:17 privilege [2] - 32:6, 35:1 problem [5] - 22:15, 22:16, 24:7, 26:10, 30:3 problems [1] - 33:14 **Proceedings** [1] - 35:9 proceedings [1] - 36:10 process [1] - 28:25 **Proctor** [3] - 8:10, 8:12, 22:3 produce [2] - 11:6, 18:3 produced [1] - 17:7 product [6] - 11:7, 15:4, 18:9, 18:15, 27:22, 29:15 product's [1] - 12:4 production [10] - 5:24, 6:8, 9:13, 11:12, 12:7, 12:22, 13:10, 13:12, 13:18, 13:20 productions [2] - 6:17, 17:24 **Productions** [1] - 6:14 products [29] - 8:4, 9:5, 11:9, 11:13, 11:21, 12:7, 12:11, 12:23, 14:10,

14:12, 15:7, 15:11, 15:19, 16:10, 17:14, 18:4, 21:13, 22:2, 22:4, 24:15, 24:16, 26:23, 30:9, 30:12, 30:22 **PRODUCTS** [1] - 1:5 progress [1] - 22:12 promote [1] - 26:23 proper [1] - 18:12 **properly** [1] - 25:6 **proposals** [1] - 10:3 proposed [1] - 7:18 provide [4] - 7:23, 13:13, 13:25, 30:20 **provided** [1] - 28:15 providers [4] - 4:12, 4:20, 4:23, 5:8 provides [1] - 19:12 providing [1] - 5:8 **public** [2] - 17:7, 18:13 purposes [1] - 6:25 **PURSUANT** [1] - 3:8 pursuant [1] - 33:2 **put** [4] - 4:9, 13:2, 15:12, 27:23 putting [1] - 10:18

# Q

quartz [1] - 24:18 quash [3] - 11:24, 25:16, 32:4 questions [4] - 5:16, 8:25, 9:17, 10:22 quickly [3] - 32:22, 33:22, 34:12

# R

ran [2] - 16:3, 20:11
rather [1] - 23:16
RE [1] - 1:4
reaching [1] - 26:4
read [2] - 7:25, 9:21
reading [1] - 23:18
ready [1] - 7:8
real [2] - 22:15, 23:16
really [6] - 9:15, 16:1,
21:5, 22:9, 28:13, 34:11
reason [2] - 19:11, 27:1
reasonable [2] - 15:1,
34:9
REATH [1] - 1:19
receipts [1] - 10:1

26:14

**repeatedly** [1] - 26:6

report [1] - 19:6

Reporter [2] - 36:7

**REPORTER** [2] - 1:25,

received [1] - 28:11 receiving [1] - 5:12 recipients [2] - 4:19, 32:12 recommendation [1] -31:10 record [12] - 4:6, 4:8, 4:10, 5:20, 5:21, 6:9, 7:12, 7:13, 17:7, 24:8, 35:7, 35:8 redraft [1] - 33:15 **REES** [1] - 2:10 **references** [1] - 8:24 referencing [1] - 9:18 referred [1] - 26:6 referring [1] - 23:24 regard [22] - 4:13, 4:15, 5:3, 5:6, 5:24, 9:6, 11:1, 11:2, 12:15, 12:17, 13:18, 14:14, 16:8, 16:16, 17:13, 17:16, 18:5, 18:13, 19:9, 23:23, 26:17 regarding [4] - 5:25, 9:4, 9:5, 12:16 regulated [1] - 12:18 regulatory [5] - 6:23, 15:4, 19:20, 21:17, 32:2 **Regulatory** [1] - 10:12 relate [2] - 30:8, 30:24 related [11] - 6:19, 6:21, 11:8, 12:11, 12:22, 16:10, 17:12, 18:4, 21:14, 23:5, 24:21 relates [2] - 20:21, 21:12 relating [2] - 8:19, 24:14 relationship [11] - 8:12, 8:18, 9:1, 9:22, 10:11, 10:22, 16:22, 19:10, 24:9, 24:11 relative [2] - 36:13, 36:16 **relevance** [3] - 9:10, 15:9, 26:4 relevant [6] - 8:4, 14:9, 20:13, 21:11, 24:2, 24:4 remember [1] - 28:2 remuneration [1] - 10:4 remunerations [1] -

3:16 represent [1] - 14:4 representation [1] -27:19 representative [1] -26:20 request [3] - 22:20, 26:12, 30:6 requests [8] - 6:5, 7:9, 8:8, 9:12, 9:13, 26:11, 31:13, 32:19 research [2] - 6:22, 17:19 resolve [2] - 33:16, 34:21 resources [3] - 16:11, 16:13, 16:14 respect [2] - 7:1, 21:6 respond [3] - 31:18, 31:20, 32:14 response [1] - 6:7 responsive [1] - 6:21 responsiveness [2] -5:24, 6:16 restraints [1] - 5:5 **Review** [1] - 10:16 review [4] - 6:16, 10:18, 18:1, 28:23 reviewing [1] - 17:23 rise [1] - 4:2 risk [2] - 10:16, 21:22 **ROTH** [1] - 1:17 **RPR** [1] - 1:24 run [2] - 20:19, 21:2 rushing [1] - 13:23 Russoniello [4] - 3:15, 36:6, 36:23, 36:24 RUSSONIELLO [2] -

# S

1:24, 3:16

S/Vincent [2] - 3:15, 36:23 safety [10] - 6:22, 10:16, 10:20, 12:16, 15:16, 16:8, 16:16, 17:16, 18:6, 19:12 SALES [1] - 1:5 sales [4] - 15:6, 19:13, 19:16, 24:3 salt [1] - 33:21 Schedule [6] - 8:11, 8:24, 9:21, 13:4, 24:9, 29:17 schedules [1] - 22:18 science [7] - 10:14, 17:19, 18:10, 21:11, 27:15, 28:16, 29:23 scientific [5] - 16:14, 16:16, 18:13, 26:3, 28:23 **scope** [5] - 8:1, 14:16, 14:23, 22:7, 35:1 second [1] - 9:4 **SECTION** [1] - 3:8 see [14] - 8:15, 13:21, 18:1, 22:18, 22:19, 22:20, 23:13, 23:17, 26:14, 26:24, 29:1, 31:24 select [1] - 20:9 send [2] - 33:15, 34:22 sense [2] - 8:6, 22:18 sent [5] - 4:11, 4:14, 4:16, 7:18, 19:23 sentence [1] - 7:2 separate [5] - 17:3, 31:1, 32:4, 32:9, 34:25 serve [1] - 33:12 served [10] - 7:16, 8:9, 11:19, 19:4, 21:15, 29:4, 29:5, 32:20, 33:17, 33:18 services [1] - 5:8 serving [3] - 7:9, 10:5, 11:22 set [1] - 36:11 **SEYFARTH** [1] - 2:6 **shaking** [1] - 25:17 share [1] - 16:11 shared [4] - 15:22, 16:4, 17:19, 18:11 **sharing** [1] - 16:15 **SHAW** [1] - 2:6 **SHOOK** [1] - 1:21 show [1] - 15:24 **Shower** [4] - 6:20, 30:23 showing [1] - 9:22 side [2] - 18:25, 22:12 sides' [1] - 34:22 silica [2] - 11:2, 24:18 similar [1] - 20:16 similarly [1] - 14:14 **simply** [2] - 11:20, 33:12 single [1] - 13:24 slow [1] - 19:22

slow-step [1] - 19:22

third-party [4] - 12:6,

slowing [1] - 22:12 slowly [1] - 19:3 **Society** [1] - 29:10 someone [1] - 16:23 sometime [1] - 18:4 **somewhere** [1] - 15:23 sound [1] - 26:18 sounds [1] - 34:24 specifically [3] - 5:25, 6:5, 30:23 specifications [1] - 6:23 **St** [1] - 6:6 stake [1] - 28:5 start [4] - 8:8, 10:23, 12:3, 31:3 **State** [1] - 36:8 **STATE** [1] - 1:8 **state** [2] - 6:1, 13:15 **States** [1] - 36:6 **STATES** [2] - 1:1, 1:8 **STATUS** [1] - 1:4 Steering [1] - 1:18 STENOGRAPHIC [1] -3:10 stenographically [1] -36:10 step [6] - 19:22, 20:6, 23:11, 23:23, 25:15, 27:6 still [1] - 5:14 stone [1] - 18:18 stored [1] - 21:5 **STREET** [1] - 1:8 **strictly** [1] - 21:17 **strike** [1] - 24:12 studies [2] - 16:3, 29:24 study [2] - 26:3, 30:2 **submission** [1] - 34:18 **submitted** [2] - 6:7, 17:5 subpoena [6] - 11:19, 13:10, 13:11, 19:23, 31:24, 32:5 subpoenas [18] - 7:16, 7:21, 8:2, 8:3, 8:8, 11:24, 15:1, 19:24, 21:16, 21:17, 22:6, 22:19, 23:10, 23:25, 25:5, 29:3, 32:13 suggested [1] - 5:2 suggestion [1] - 33:10 Supplemental [1] - 6:14 supplemental [1] - 7:9 supply [1] - 20:15

**support** [1] - 28:10 **suspect** [1] - 27:17

Т Talc [1] - 2:11 talc [46] - 6:19, 8:19, 10:6, 10:16, 10:20, 11:3, 11:6, 11:12, 12:7, 12:11, 12:16, 12:18, 12:22, 14:11, 14:13, 15:3, 15:7, 15:11, 15:16, 15:19, 16:9, 16:10, 17:5, 17:14, 17:16, 18:3, 18:9, 19:13, 20:9, 20:11, 20:13, 20:14, 20:19, 21:2, 21:3, 21:8, 21:9, 24:14, 24:16, 24:17, 24:24, 27:16, 28:17, 30:9, 30:22, 30:25 talcum [2] - 24:14, 24:16 talks [1] - 10:19 target [1] - 24:1 targeted [1] - 10:24 targeting [1] - 11:17 technology [1] - 16:15 tecum [1] - 13:11 ten [1] - 19:24 terms [1] - 4:10 **TERSIGNI** [1] - 1:20 test [1] - 20:15 tested [1] - 25:1 testimony [2] - 13:10, 13:13 testing [13] - 6:22, 20:20, 20:24, 21:15, 22:21, 23:1, 23:5, 24:3, 24:20, 24:21, 27:22, 30:19, 30:21 tests [3] - 20:11, 20:19, 21:2 **TEXAS** [1] - 1:21 **THE** [7] - 1:1, 1:10, 1:11, 3:8, 3:10, 4:2, 26:8 themselves [1] - 15:16 therefore [1] - 30:1 they've [3] - 18:10, 25:3, 30:10 third [18] - 7:16, 9:20, 12:6, 12:20, 14:1, 14:5, 14:14, 14:25, 15:8, 16:6, 17:24, 18:17, 19:4,

19:24, 26:12, 31:17,

33:17, 33:18

14:25, 17:24, 19:24 **THOMAS** [1] - 2:7 **THORNTON** [1] - 2:11 three [4] - 8:24, 8:25, 9:16, 9:25 threw [1] - 18:18 throughout [1] - 26:6 throw [1] - 33:21 tied [2] - 10:13, 17:4 tisi [1] - 27:10 **TISI** [7] - 1:16, 7:11, 27:11, 29:5, 30:13, 30:18, 31:6 Tisi [1] - 6:3 **TITLE** [1] - 3:8 **TO** [2] - 3:8, 3:9 today [5] - 12:2, 25:18, 33:2, 33:23, 34:20 today's [1] - 7:18 together [3] - 10:18, 16:17, 17:4 topic [5] - 27:20, 28:8, 28:22, 29:11, 29:13 toward [1] - 22:13 toxicity [3] - 20:12, 21:8, 21:9 **Tozzi** [3] - 16:24, 16:25, 22:23 trade [8] - 12:13, 12:14, 12:21, 16:7, 21:8, 26:21, 27:3 transcript [1] - 36:9 **TRANSCRIPT** [2] - 1:4, 3:9 TRANSCRIPTION [1] -3:10 transferred [1] - 4:15 **TRENTON** [1] - 1:8 tried [3] - 14:15, 19:22, 24:1 troubled [1] - 23:9 true [1] - 36:9 **try** [2] - 31:20, 33:16 trying [8] - 12:23, 18:16, 19:2, 19:7, 22:11, 23:1, 28:20, 31:7 turn [1] - 14:1 two [4] - 9:17, 9:23, 21:20, 34:19 **Tylenol** [2] - 14:11, 14:12 type [1] - 28:20

U

**U.S** [2] - 1:25, 3:16 U.S.C [1] - 3:8 ultimately [1] - 10:19 under [1] - 6:13 understood [1] - 29:20 undue [1] - 28:24 unduly [1] - 31:11 **UNITED** [2] - 1:1, 1:8 **United** [1] - 36:6 unless [1] - 15:22 unreasonable [1] - 34:9 unrelated [1] - 26:10 **up** [7] - 19:4, 23:13, 25:5, 25:12, 27:7, 27:12, 28:20 **USDJ** [1] - 1:10 USMJ [1] - 1:11

#### V

various [4] - 7:17, 19:11, 28:7, 30:11 vary [1] - 9:13 Vincent [2] - 36:6, 36:24 VINCENT [2] - 1:24, 3:16 VIRGINIA [2] - 1:15, 1:16

# W

wait [1] - 33:3 Wait [1] - 33:13 warn [1] - 18:12 WASHINGTON [2] -1:22, 2:7 weeks [1] - 34:19 weigh [2] - 28:8, 29:11 weighed [5] - 27:16, 27:20, 27:24, 28:21, 29:12 whole [1] - 23:13 William [1] - 31:25 **WOLFSON** [35] - 1:10, 4:3, 4:8, 5:20, 5:23, 7:6, 7:12, 7:20, 10:21, 11:6, 11:16, 12:25, 13:9, 15:9, 15:21, 16:24, 23:4, 24:5, 25:22, 27:5, 27:10, 29:3, 29:19, 30:15, 30:19, 31:12, 32:1, 32:6, 32:9, 33:6, 33:10, 33:25, 34:3, 35:2, 35:6 word [2] - 6:25, 7:5 words [1] - 7:3

**world** [3] - 15:3, 19:23, 20:24

Υ

year [2] - 5:15, 26:9 years [3] - 5:9, 21:4, 30:12